

FILED  
LEWIS COUNTY

2020 MAY 26 AM 11:06

SUPERIOR COURT  
LEWIS COUNTY  
LEWIS COUNTY, WASHINGTON

20-2-00394-21  
CMP 2  
Complaint  
8237956



JEFFREY HAINES,  
PLAINTIFF,

vs.

CITY OF CENTRALIA, CENTRALIA POLICE DEPT.,  
Chief Nielsen of the Centralia Police Dept.,  
various unnamed police officers and staff;  
DEFENDANTS

20 2 0039421

) No.

) COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

1. Jeffrey Haines is a resident of Lewis County, Washington.

2. The City of Centralia is a Washington municipal corporation.

3. The Centralia Police Department is constituted under the laws of the state of

Washington. Chief Nielsen was the chief of the Centralia Police Department during all times

pertinent to this complaint.

) COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

4. Jeffrey Haines was charged with DUI in Centralia Municipal Court. He was placed on a pre-trial 24/7 alcohol monitoring program which required him to travel to Centralia twice a day, everyday, and submit a sample of his breath for alcohol content. If the portable breath test machine, which has never been shown in court to be accurate and reliable, and is not admissible

in court, showed a positive reading, Haines was taken to jail without any hearing in court or even any notice to his lawyer. He was taken to jail for a predetermined length of time and given no bail so that he could not bail out. There was zero means to prevent false imprisonment or incarceration due to mistakes or inaccurate or unreliable evidence.

5. Jeffrey Haines was charged with DUI in Centralia Municipal Court. He was placed on a pre-trial 24/7 alcohol monitoring program which required him to travel to Centralia twice a day, everyday, and submit a sample of his breath for alcohol content. If the portable breath test

5. The 24/7 program was run by the Centralia Police Dept. Various police officers were in charge, which is problematic given the lack of due process involved, and is not admissible given authority to jail Haines at their sole discretion, and they needed no further authority from a court. Officers could jail Haines at any time if they chose to do so. If he failed to show up for his breath tests, or if he failed a breath test device reported alcohol, or if officers believed Haines had been in a bar or tavern – they jailed him, and gave him no hearing and gave no notice to his lawyer, and there was never a confirmation test done on a breath test machine shown to be accurate and reliable. Haines simply had to sit in jail until he had served his time, and his lawyer did not even know he was there most of the time. Haines was jailed this way on a number of occasions and never once received a hearing prior to being jailed by the Centralia Police Dept. Various police officers were in charge, which is problematic given the lack of due process involved, and is not admissible given admissibility. The law in this state is clear and has been for a number of years. Tests of bodily substances for evidence are searches, and require a search warrant, which in turn requires probable cause. *State v. Rose*, 146 Wn.2d App. 439, 191 P.3d 83 (2008); *a Blomstrom v. Tripp*, 189 Wn.2d 379, 402 P.3d 831 (2017). Jeffrey Haines was required to perform many UA's, and there was never a search warrant. He was jailed many times without due process of law as well.

Therefore, the Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

... Damages for each day he was incarcerated; damages for each time he was jailed without a hearing designed to detect and prevent false imprisonments; and damages for each time he was jailed without any notice to his lawyer, interfering with the fundamental right to counsel of choice.

DATED: May 21, 2020

Bruce Finlay, WSBA #18  
Attorney for Plaintiff  
P.O. Box 3  
Shelton, WA 98584  
(360) 432-1778

FILED  
LEWIS COUNTY

2020 MAY 26 AM 11:06

SUPERIOR COURT  
CLERK'S OFFICE

20-2-00394-21  
8M  
Summons  
8287957



SUPERIOR COURT  
LEWIS COUNTY, WASHINGTON

**20 2 0039421**

JEFFREY HAINES,  
PLAINTIFF,  
vs.

No.  
SUMMONS  
(Twenty Days)

CITY OF CENTRALIA, CENTRALIA POLICE DEPT.,  
Chief Nielsen of the Centralia Police Dept.,  
various unnamed police officers and staff;  
DEFENDANTS

TO THE DEFENDANTS: A lawsuit has been started against you in the above entitled court by Jeffrey Haines, Plaintiff. Plaintiff's claim is stated in the written Complaint, a copy of which is served upon you with this summons.

In order to defend against this lawsuit, you must respond to the complaint by stating your defense in writing, and by serving a copy upon the person signing this summons within 20 days after the service of this summons, excluding the day of service, or a default judgment may be entered against you without notice. A default judgment is one where plaintiff is entitled to what he asks for because you have not responded. If you serve a notice of appearance on the undersigned person, you are entitled to notice before a default judgment may be entered.

I have read the above with its summons.

In order to defend against this lawsuit, you must respond to the complaint by stating your

You may demand that the plaintiff file this lawsuit with the court. If you do so, the demand must be in writing and must be served upon the person signing this summons. Within 14 days after you serve the demand, the plaintiff must file this lawsuit with the court, or the service on you of this summons and complaint will be void.

If you wish to seek the advice of an attorney in this matter, you should do so promptly so that your written response, if any, may be served on time.

This summons is issued pursuant to rule 4 of the Superior Court Civil Rules of the State of Washington.

DATED this 21st day of May, 2020, at 03, hours, in the city of Shelton, the defendant must  
serve a copy of the complaint and all other papers in this case, upon the Plaintiff's attorney, Within 14 days after  
Bruce Philay, WSBA #18799  
Attorney for Plaintiff  
POB 3  
Shelton, WA 98584  
360-432-1778  
brucef@hcc.net

Washington, D. C., March 10, 1908.—Signed by the Secretary of State, Wm. H. Taft, of the Seal.

W. H. G. & Co. - 1879  
W. H. G. & Co. - 1879  
W. H. G. & Co. - 1879

<sup>12</sup> See also the discussion of the "right to be forgotten" in the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), Article 17(1).